

## Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

### Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

#### Section A: Overview

1. **Date of Submission:** 2011-02-22

2. **Agency:** 007

3. **Bureau:** 57

4. **Name of this Investment:** Global Combat Support System - Air Force

5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier (UPI):** 007-57-01-04-01-5069-00

6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2012?:** Operations and Maintenance

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?** FY2001 or earlier

8.

- a. **Provide a brief summary of the investment and justification, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap, specific accomplishments expected by the budget year and the related benefit to the mission, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment.**

GCSS-AF is the means by which Agile Combat Support (ACS) Automated Information Systems (AIS) will be integrated to improve business processes. GCSS-AF provides a core set of infrastructure services for global combat support information, with appropriate security credentials to any authorized entity. The Integration Framework (IF) is a modern, web-based, service-oriented architecture based system that enables the Air Force to integrate and deliver decision quality asset visibility information to AF MAJCOM and Combatant Commanders. GCSS-AF has more than 800K military, civilian and contractor users supporting the Department of Defense (DoD). Primary GCSS-AF components include: 1) The Integration Framework which provides a common hosting and messaging environment; 2) Security services which provide mechanisms to identify and authenticate individual users for role-based access, supporting Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) certificates and keys which allow for integration and interoperability of automated information systems (AISs) and cross-functional capabilities to facilitate secure, data sharing across functional domains; 3) the AF Portal, with security layers, to provide a common secure entry point for a reduced sign-on capability to mission applications; 4) a presentation layer on both the Non-classified Internet Protocol Router Network (NIPRNET) and Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNet); and 5) Data Services warehouse which is a consolidated repository of AF combat support information. The warehouse allows for a consolidation of automated information systems to enhance business processing efficiencies and supporting business analytics to allow our Expeditionary Aerospace Force to execute the Air Force mission throughout the full spectrum of military operations. The program's main objective is sustainment while improving the availability and efficiency of the system. The specific accomplishments expected in FY12 include a 5% increase of communities/organizations able to discover, access, share information services; an additional 5000 active registered users using GCSS-AF to perform their jobs and an overall improvement in the GCSS-AF Integrated Framework System Availability. These accomplishments are directly beneficial to the program's mission by increasing availability of the Central Processing Units to a cumulative uptime with the Threshold = 23.5 hours daily and Objective of 23.9 (99.5%) per the ORD. .

- b. **Provide any links to relevant websites that would be useful to gain additional information on the**

investment including links to GAO and IG reports.

Title	Link
NONE	

9.

- a. Provide the date of the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approval of this investment.  
2001-12-21
- b. Provide the date of the most recent or planned approved project charter. 2001-06-18

10. Contact information?

- a. Program/Project Manager Name: \*  
Phone Number: \*  
Email: \*
- b. Business Function Owner Name (i.e. Executive Agent or Investment Owner): GEN William L. Shelton, AFSPC/CC  
Phone Number: \*  
Email: \*

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (choose only one per FAC-P/PM or DAWIA): Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

## Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding  
(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Planning & Acquisition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition(DME):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations, Maintenance, Disposition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal O&M and Disposition Costs (SS):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (not including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

**Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding**  
**(In millions of dollars)**

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Costs:									

2. Insert the number of years covered in the column “PY-1 and earlier”: 2

3. Insert the number of years covered in the column “BY+4 and beyond”: \*

4. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2011 President’s Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

\*

## Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Contracts Table

Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	Solicitation ID	Alternative financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value (M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Completed	Short description of acquisition
Awarded		<a href="#">FA877104D0007</a>			*	*	\$10,020,000.0	Firm Fixed Price	N	2004-01-01		Y	Migrated Data Value Unknown

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

\*

3.

- a. Has an Acquisition Plan been developed? If yes, please answer the questions that follow \*
- b. Does the Acquisition Plan reflect the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 \*
- c. Was the Acquisition Plan approved in accordance with agency requirements \*
- d. If "yes," enter the date of approval? \*
- e. Is the acquisition plan consistent with your agency Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan? \*
- f. Does the acquisition plan meet the requirements of EOs 13423 and 13514? \*
- g. If an Acquisition Plan has not been developed, provide a brief explanation.

\*

## Part II: IT Capital Investments

### Section A: General

1.
  - a. Confirm that the IT Program/Project manager has the following competencies: configuration management, data management, information management, information resources strategy and planning, information systems/network security, IT architecture, IT performance assessment, infrastructure design, systems integration, systems life cycle, technology awareness, and capital planning and investment control. yes
  - b. If not, confirm that the PM has a development plan to achieve competencies either by direct experience or education. yes
2. Describe the progress of evaluating cloud computing alternatives for service delivery to support this investment. IT systems which support service delivery to the GCSS-AF must maintain security and virtualization standards used for interoperability. GCSS-AF has been delivering services through cloud computing.
3. Provide the date of the most recent or planned Quality Assurance Plan 2010-12-08
4.
  - a. Provide the UPI of all other investments that have a significant dependency on the successful implementation of this investment.  
007-57-01-04-02-0388-00,007-57-01-05-02-3222-00,007-57-01-04-02-3634-00,007-57-01-01-01-0178-00,007-57-01-01-02-0487-00,007-57-01-04-01-0483-00
  - b. If this investment is significantly dependent on the successful implementation of another investment(s), please provide the UPI(s). 007-57-02-07-02-0258-00
5. An Alternatives Analysis must be conducted for all Major Investments with Planning and Acquisition (DME) activities and evaluate the costs and benefits of at least three alternatives and the status quo. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date of the most recent or planned alternatives analysis for this investment. 2002-01-24
6. Risks must be actively managed throughout the lifecycle of the investment. The Risk Management Plan and risk register must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date that the risk register was last updated. 2010-12-21

## Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
In Dec 01, GCSS-AF was declared a DoD Rapid Improvement Team (RIT) program and operated as such for 3 years. Under the RIT process Evolutionary Acquisition Decision Reviews were conducted IAW pgm spiral dev process w/ no addtl milestones to report.		*	\$830.0	\$800.4	2001-12-15	2001-12-31	2009-12-09	2009-12-09	100.00%	95.00%
World Wide Roll Out of Air Force Portal--the presentation layer for GCSS-AF. Continued to develop capability for the IF and application hosting; comprised of a set of common tools (security, presentation services, performance mgt, COTS S/W, etc.).		*	\$77.8	\$70.4	2001-12-15	2001-12-31	2004-04-30	2004-04-01	100.00%	100.00%
The Full		*	\$81.8	\$81.8	2008-07-01	2008-07-01	2009-10-30	2009-12-14	100.00%	95.00%

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Deployment Decision Review was replanned for October 2009 and subsequently was rescheduled for December 2009.										
Award of GCSS-AF Bridge Contract. Avoids gap in service due to delayed award of the GCSS-AF Engineering and Sustainment contract.		*	\$78.5	\$0.0	2009-09-28	2009-12-09	2011-06-01		28.00%	35.00%
Award of the follow-On GCSS-AF Engineering & Sustainment contract to support enterprise services in existing NIPR and SIPR environments		*	\$774.0	\$0.0	2011-04-21		2018-02-19		0.00%	0.00%

**2. If the investment cost, schedule, or performance variances are not within 10 percent of the current baseline, provide a complete analysis of the reasons for the variances, the corrective actions to be taken, and the most likely estimate at completion.** Variances are not out of baseline. Current contract baseline is \$78.5M and the quarterly Contract Funds Status Report is provided IAW CDRL A002. In addition, the Program Office management team meets weekly with the System Integrator to status cost, schedule, performance supportability and associated contract activities.

**3. For mixed lifecycle or operations and maintenance investments an Operational Analysis must be performed annually. Operational analysis may identify**



the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Insert the date of the most recent or planned operational analysis. 2010-07-13

4. Did the Operational analysis cover all 4 areas of analysis: Customer Results, Strategic and Business Results, Financial Performance, and Innovation? no

Section C: Financial Management Systems

Table II.C.1: Financial Management Systems			
System(s) Name	System acronym	Type of Financial System	BY Funding
*	*	*	*

Section D: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (For Multi-Agency Collaborations only)

Table II.D.1. Customer Table:	
Customer Agency	Joint exhibit approval date
NONE	

Table II.D.2. Shared Service Providers		
Shared Service Provider (Agency)	Shared Service Asset Title	Shared Service Provider Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011)
*	*	*

Table II.D.3. For IT Investments, Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):							
Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2012)	CY Monetary Contribution	CY “In-Kind” Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Monetary Contribution	BY “In-Kind” Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
NONE							

Table II.D.4. Legacy Systems Being Replaced		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	Current UPI	Date of the System Retirement
*	*	*

## Section E: Performance Information

Table I.E.1a. Performance Metric Attributes

Measurement Area (For IT Assets)	Measurement Grouping (For IT Assets)	Measurement Indicator	Reporting Frequency	Unit of Measure	Performance Measure Direction	Baseline	Year Baseline Established for this measure (Origination Date)
Processes and Activities	Security Management	CAC enable the AF Portal to provide enterprise-level authentication and authorization	annual	Security compliance	Positive	TBD	2009-10-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	Implement CAC logon to meet JTF GNO Communications Task Order mandate regarding Smart Card technology in order to provide over 30 hosted application and 100 Reduced Sign-On apps security authentication and authorization	CAC enabled Login implemented 15 January 2010. PMO and Lead Command continue to work with Users/Applications that require assistance. The program is 100% compliant for PKI.	Met	2011-02-11
Processes and Activities	Security Management	Continue to expand the use of the Common Access Card (CAC) External Certification Authority (ECA) for Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) for NIPRNET access to capabilities and applications	annual	Increase in the Applications and capabilities that utilize CAC credentials for Role Based Access	TBD	TBD - Identify the numbers of applications that are not implementing CAC usage.	2010-10-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	TBD	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Mission and Business Results	Logistics Management	GCSS-AF fuses logistic capabilities for greater	annual	Test Results, Logistic Users Feedback and	TBD	Analysis of supply support activity time TBD	2010-10-01

interoperability to increase business processing for supply support activities.

Snap shot of user metric's dashboard for Maintenance Operations.

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
-------------	--------	----------------	------------------------------	--------------

2011

90% successful testing of leveraged net-centric, web-enabled capabilities and interface services offered by the GCSS-AF program. Logistic community leadership documents satisfaction and quality improvements.

TBD

Not Due

2011-02-11

Technology	Availability	GCSS-AF Integrated Framework Availability	monthly	System Uptime	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
------------	--------------	---	---------	---------------	-----	-----	------------

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
-------------	--------	----------------	------------------------------	--------------

2010

System Availability is the cumulative uptime of the Central Processing Units with the Threshold = 23.5 hours daily and Objective of 23.9 (99.5%) per the ORD.

Availability baseline has been met. Cumulative IF availability as of 15 January 2010 is 99.9%. Cumulative framework availability was 99.9% at the end of FY 2010.

Met

2011-02-11

Technology	Availability	GCSS-AF Integrated Framework Availability	monthly	System Uptime	Positive	TBD	2010-09-01
------------	--------------	---	---------	---------------	----------	-----	------------

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
-------------	--------	----------------	------------------------------	--------------

2011

System Availability is the cumulative uptime of the Central Processing Units with the Threshold = 23.5 hours daily and Objective of 23.9 (99.5%) per the ORD.

As of 5 January 2011 the cumulative framework availability was 99.9%.

Met

2011-02-11

Technology	Availability	GCSS-AF Integrated Framework Availability	quarterly	System Uptime	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
------------	--------------	---	-----------	---------------	-----	-----	------------

			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
Technology	Availability	GCSS-AF Integrated Framework Availability	2012	System Availability is the cumulative uptime of the Central Processing Units with the Threshold = 23.5 hours daily and Objective of 23.9 (99.5%) per the ORD.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
			annual	TBD	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
Technology	Availability	GCSS-AF Integrated Framework Availability	2013	System Availability is the cumulative uptime of the Central Processing Units with the Threshold = 23.5 hours daily and Objective of 23.9 (99.5%) per the ORD.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
			annual	TBD	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
Customer Results	Productivity	NIPRNet Search function returns results that more closely matches the relative importance and centrality requirements of the user in less than three seconds.	2014	System Availability is the cumulative uptime of the Central Processing Units with the Threshold = 23.5 hours daily and Objective of 23.9 (99.5%) per the ORD.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
			annual	User Feedback	Positive	TBD	2009-10-01

			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	Improve the Search functionality with appropriate results related to query, increase users ability to discover, access, and share information services.	Of the over 800,000 users of the AF Portal, there is quantifiable user feedback metrics indicates that Search functionality is improving and the feedback shows a positive trend. Results are returned within 5 seconds.	Met	2011-02-11
Customer Results	Efficiency	NIPRNet Search function returns results that more closely matches the relative importance and centrality requirements of the user in less than three seconds.	annual	Survey, User Feedback, and/or Help Desk reports	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	5% increase of communities/organization able to discover, access, share information services. Search function user query responses improve by 1 minute from initiation.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Processes and Activities	Security Management	Number of applications/capabilities brought under the GCSS-AF Security Layer	annual	Number of new applications/capabilities	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2014	5 Applications/reduced sign-on (RSO) applications brought to production per year.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20

Processes and Activities	Security Management	Number of applications/capabilities brought under the GCSS-AF Security Layer	annual	Number of new applications/capabilities	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2015	5 Applications/reduced sign-on (RSO) applications brought to production per year.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Mission and Business Results	Security Management	Number of applications/capabilities brought under the GCSS-AF Security Layer increases security and reduces stove-piped security implementation.	annual	Number of new applications/capabilities	Positive	TBD	2010-01-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	5 Applications/reduced sign-on (RSO) applications brought to production per year.	As of 22 Jan 2010 43 mission apps and 247 RSOs are hosted on NIPRNET and SIPRNET.	Met	2011-02-11
Mission and Business Results	Security Management	Number of applications/capabilities brought under the GCSS-AF Security Layer, increases security and reduces stove-piped security implementation	annual	Number of new applications/capabilities	Positive	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	5 Applications/reduced sign-on (RSO) applications brought to production per year.	REMIS (Reliability and Maintainability Information System) & MPC-s (Mission Planning Central - SIPR) have been deployed. RSOs in process: Battlefield Airmen	Met	2011-02-11



		Management System, Air Force Test and Analysis Tool, & Program Management System					
Processes and Activities	Security Management	Number of applications/capabilities brought under the GCSS-AF Security Layer, increases security and reduces stove-piped security implementation	annual	Number of new applications/capabilities	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	10 Applications/reduced sign-on (RSO) applications brought to production per year.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Processes and Activities	Security Management	Number of applications/capabilities brought under the GCSS-AF Security Layer, increases security and reduces stove-piped security implementation.	annual	Number of new applications/capabilities	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	10 Applications/reduced sign-on (RSO) applications brought to production per year.	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Mission and Business Results	Continuity of Operations	Provide disaster recovery and continuity of operations through technological advances provided by virtual operations	annual	Disaster recovery and continuity of operations process test results	Positive	TBD	2010-01-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	Test processes and	GCSS-AF COOP	Met	2010-09-20

			procedures to ensure continuity of operations exists for defined mission application with Recovery Time Objective (RTO) of 24 hours (MAC II requirement); production environment for DEAMs users calls for recovery 6 hrs from failure		Capability stood up at DISA site in Ogden UT. During the two failover and failback tests on 15 Nov 09 and 22 Nov 09, data replication was successful. COOP RecoverPoint data logs show continuous data replication between main and backup		
Customer Results	Productivity	Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) with an effective meta-data environment and AF Enterprise Identity Repository	quarterly	Survey, User Feedback, and/or Help Desk reports	TBD	TBD	2010-10-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	5% increase of communities/organization able to discover, access, share information services. Search function user query responses improve by 1 minute from initiation.	As of 5 January 2011, it takes well under 1 minute to conduct a search on the Portal (1.399 seconds). GCSS-AF is currently meeting the 5% of networking having over 1M activity items on the Portal as of 5 January 2011.	Met	2011-02-11
Customer Results	Customer Retention	Track the number of active registered users using GCSS-AF in performing their job as a witness to the market penetration of GCSS-AF as an enterprise tool	quarterly	Number of active registered users	Positive	TBD	2009-10-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	An increase of 20,000+ GCSS-AF active registered users	There were 24,778 active NEW users as of 22 January 2010 from Fall 2009. Retirees and	Met	2011-02-11

personnel who left military added to number of inactive accounts. As of 20 Aug 2010, there are 783,621 active accounts on AF Portal.

Customer Results	Customer Retention	Track the number of active registered users using GCSS-AF in performing their job as a witness to the market penetration of GCSS-AF as an enterprise tool	annual	Number of active registered users	Positive	TBD	2010-01-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	An increase of 5,000 GCSS-AF active registered users	The program has averaged 2000 new accounts per week during FY11 year to date.	Met	2011-02-11
Customer Results	Customer Retention	Track the number of active registered users using GCSS-AF in performing their job as a witness to the market penetration of GCSS-AF as an enterprise tool	annual	Number of active registered users	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	An increase of 5,000 GCSS-AF active registered users	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Customer Results	Customer Retention	Track the number of active registered users using GCSS-AF in performing their job as a witness to the market penetration of GCSS-AF as an enterprise tool	annual	Number of active registered users	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

Customer Results	Customer Retention	Track the number of active registered users using GCSS-AF in performing their job as a witness to the market penetration of GCSS-AF as an enterprise tool	2013	An increase of 5,000 GCSS-AF active registered users	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
			semi-annual	TBD	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target “Met” or “Not Met”	Last Updated
			2014	An increase of 5,000 GCSS-AF active registered users	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Customer Results	Customer Retention	Track the number of active registered users using GCSS-AF in performing their job as a witness to the market penetration of GCSS-AF as an enterprise tool	semi-annual	TBD	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target “Met” or “Not Met”	Last Updated
			2015	An increase of 5,000 GCSS-AF active registered users	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Track the number of functional sets of application data (capabilities) that are added to the data warehouse for on-line analytical processing (OLAP) and reporting	annual	Number of functional capabilities that are added	Positive	TBD	2009-10-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target “Met” or “Not Met”	Last Updated
			2010	5 new applications/ capabilities	4 new capabilities were added: Expeditionary Combat Support System	Met	2011-02-11

(ECSS), AFFOR  
Collaboration Tool  
(ACT), Enterprise Data  
framework, Air Force  
Portal Professional  
Networking, and  
Collection Layer.

Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Track the number of functional sets of application data (capabilities) that are added to the data warehouse for on-line analytical processing (OLAP) and reporting	annual	Number of functional capabilities that are added	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	10 new applications/ capabilities	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Track the number of functional sets of application data (capabilities) that are added to the data warehouse for on-line analytical processing (OLAP) and reporting	semi-annual	Number of functional capabilities that are added	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	10 new applications/ capabilities	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Track the number of functional sets of application data (capabilities) that are added to the data warehouse for on-line analytical processing (OLAP) and reporting	semi-annual	Number of functional capabilities that are added	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target	Last Updated

						"Met" or "Not Met"	
Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Track the number of functional sets of application data (capabilities) that are added to the data warehouse for on-line analytical processing (OLAP) and reporting	2013	10 new applications/capabilities	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
			semi-annual	Number of functional capabilities that are added	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Track the number of functional sets of application data (capabilities) that are added to the data warehouse for on-line analytical processing (OLAP) and reporting	2014	7 new applications/capabilities	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
			semi-annual	Number of functional capabilities that are added	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Track the number of functional sets of application data (capabilities) that are added to the data warehouse for on-line analytical processing (OLAP) and reporting	2015	7 new applications/capabilities	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
			semi-annual	Number of functional capabilities that are added	TBD	TBD	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

\* - Indicates data is redacted.